

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 30 are amended. Claims 8-13 and 38-42 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 14-18, 30, and 32-37 are pending in the application.

Claims 3-4, 7, 16-18, 34-35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Fukushima (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0197879). Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, claims 1 and 30 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of corresponding dependent claims 8 and 39. Claims 8 and 39 are appropriately canceled. Claims 1 and 30 are not anticipated by Fukushima for at least the reason that they recite subject matter acknowledged by the Examiner to be non-anticipated relative to this cited reference. Dependent claims 3-4, 7, 16-18 and 34-35 are non-anticipated relative to Fukushima for at least the reason that they depend from corresponding non-anticipated base claims 1 and 30.

Claims 1, 3-6, 14-18, 30 and 32-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Combes (US Patent No. 5,725,987). The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2131 that anticipation requires each and every element of a claim to be disclosed in a single prior art reference. Claims 1, 3-6, 14-18, 30 and 32-37 are allowable over Combes for at least the reason that Combes fails to disclosed each and every element in any of those claims.

Each of claims 1 and 30 recite forming a monolayer. The Examiner indicates that monomer formation is inherent in the Combes reference. Applicant disagrees. Combes discloses a variety of surface treating coating compounds. The coating formed will, of course, depend on the compound utilized. The Combes reference indicates that the

“products obtained include hydrophobic silica, hydrophobic titania, oxides, and the like”. Nowhere does the reference indicate compounds or products limited to monomer formation (exclude reaction of the compound with itself). Applicant notes that the Examiner has the burden of proof to establish a *prima facie* case. There is no evidence set forth in either the Office Action or the Advisory Action dated 04/08/2008 that supports the Examiner’s position in support of a *prima facie* case.

Additionally Combe;s does not disclose the claims 1 and 30 recited substrate comprising a glass fiber. Accordingly, claims 1 and 30 are not anticipated by Combes.

Claims 3-6, 14-18 and 32-37 are not anticipated by Combes for at least the reason that they depend from corresponding non-anticipated base claims 1 and 30.

Claims 5-6 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukushima. Claims 1, 3-8, 14-18, 30 and 32-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mankell (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0127399) in view of Fukushima or Combes. The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2143 that a proper obviousness rejection has the following three requirements: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the combined references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Claims 1, 3-8, 14-18, 30 and 32-39 are allowable over Mankell in view of Combes for at least the reason that the references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element in any of those claims.

As amended, each of claims 1 and 30 recite forming a monolayer on a substrate surface where the substrate comprises a glass fiber and subsequently incorporating the

glass fiber into a fiberglass matrix by bonding the organic group within a polymeric material.

Neither Fukushima nor Combes discloses or suggests the claims 1 and 30 recited glass fiber substrate. Mankell discloses forming a coating on a fiberglass. However, Mankell does not disclose or suggest the recited monolayer formation or the recited subsequent incorporation into a fiberglass matrix by bonding the organic group (of the monolayer) within a polymeric layer. Further the method of fiberglass formation of the invention is distinctly advantageous. As indicated in the specification at paragraph 57, the glass fibers can be covalently bonded relative to prior art fiberglass which have a mechanical interaction as the primary interaction retaining the fiber within the polymeric matrix. Accordingly the combination of Mankell, Combes and Fukushima does not disclose or suggest the claims 1 and 30 recited forming a monolayer on a substrate surface where the substrate comprises a glass fiber and subsequently incorporating the glass fiber into a fiberglass matrix by bonding the organic group within a polymeric material. Claims 1 and 30 are therefore not rendered obvious by the cited combinations of Fukushima, Combes and Mankell.

Claims 3-8, 14-18, and 32-7 are allowable over Fukushima, Mankell and Combes for at least the reason that they depend from corresponding allowable base claims 1 and 30.

Claims 9-13 and 40-42 are canceled as being drawn to non-elected species.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 1, 3-7, 14-18, 30 and 32-37 are allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests formal allowance of such claims in the Examiner's next action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2008

By: /Jennifer J. Taylor/
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 48,711